

Remarks

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks. Claims 1-11, 15-24, 78, 79, 81, and 83 are pending in the application. No claims have been allowed. Claims 1 and 15 are independent. Claims 1 and 15 have been amended. Claims 28-40, 43-49, 80, and 82 have been canceled without disclaimer and without prejudice to pursuing in a continuing application.

Cited Art

The Office action (“Action”) applies the following cited art: U.S. Patent No. 6,300,888 to Chen et al. (“Chen”), U.S. Patent No. 5,884,269 to Cellier et al. (“Cellier”), and U.S. Patent No. 5,819,215 to Dobson et al. (“Dobson”).

Allowable Subject Matter

The Action states that each of claims 78 to 83, while objected to as dependent on a rejected base claim, would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Action, page 8. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate language of dependent claim 80. Claim 15 has been amended to incorporate language of dependent claim 82. Therefore, independent claims 1 and 15, and their dependent claims 2-11, 16-24, 78, 79, 81, and 83, should be allowable.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 103

The Action rejects claims 1-7, 11, 15-20, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Cellier. The Action rejects claims 8 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Cellier as applied to claims 1 and 15, and further in view of what the Examiner terms “Applicants’ Admitted Prior Art.” The Action rejects claims 9, 10, 22, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Cellier as applied to claims 1 and 15, and further in view of Dobson.

Applicants do not agree with the § 103 rejections or the Examiner’s characterization of “Applicants’ Admitted Prior Art.” However, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 15 (as described above) with subject matter that the

Examiner has indicated is allowable over the applied references. Therefore, independent claims 1 and 15, and their dependent claims 2-11, 16-24, 78, 79, 81, and 83, should be allowable.

Request for Interview

If any issues remain, the Examiner is formally requested to contact the undersigned attorney prior to issuance of the next Office action in order to arrange a telephonic interview. It is believed that a brief discussion of the merits of the present application may expedite prosecution. Applicants submit the foregoing formal Amendment so that the Examiner may fully evaluate Applicants' position, thereby enabling the interview to be more focused.

This request is being submitted under MPEP § 713.01, which indicates that an interview may be arranged in advance by a written request.

Conclusion

The claims should be allowable. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600
121 S.W. Salmon Street
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 595-5300
Facsimile: (503) 595-5301

By /Cory A. Jones/
Cory A. Jones
Registration No. 55,307